UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,850	02/07/2005	Thomas John	3208	4407
Striker Striker &	7590 12/28/201 Stenby	EXAMINER		
103 East Neck l	Road	NGUYEN, PHONG H		
Huntington, NY 11743			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/523,850	JOHN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHONG H. NGUYEN	3724	
 The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply 	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Jule 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 29-35 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 29,30 and 34 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 31-33 and 35 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the off Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the output of the property and the correction of the output of the property and the correction of the output of the property and the correction of the output of the property and the correction of the output of the property and the correction of the output of the correction of the	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C	` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite	

Application/Control Number: 10/523,850 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 29, 30 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick (3,880,028) in view of Ota (JP1994-102480), and evidence of Grzymislawski (3,282,677).

Regarding claim 29, Frederick teaches a method for cutting a continuously moving glass sheet during production of flat glass with an inhomogeneous thickness distribution across the glass sheet, the method comprising the steps of:

- a) providing a moving glass sheet 12 that is continuously moving in a travel direction;
- b) moving a cutting tool 16 across the moving glass sheet at an angle (90 degrees) to the travel direction of the moving glass sheet so that the cutting tool traverses a plurality of positions on the glass sheet;
 - f) mechanically breaking the glass sheet along the fissure (by a snap roll 21);

g) controlling the different cutting forces applied by the cutting tool in the different regions so that the different cutting forces are sufficient to form the fissure but not so large as to cause uncontrolled breaking of the glass sheet during formation of the fissure prior to the mechanically breaking. (This step is inherent in Frederick since Frederick teaches lower the cutting head to a proper distant for cutting glass to desired shapes and dimensions).

Page 3

See Figs. 1-2.

Regarding steps (c) and (e) which are to apply variable cutting force on the glass sheet wherein the cutting force is increased where the variable thickness increases and the cutting force is decreased where the variable thickness decreases, and to control the variable cutting force. Frederick does not explicitly teach those steps. However, Frederick teaches using conventional biasing mean for biasing the scoring device 16 to the glass.

Grzymislawski teaches that the conventional biasing means (spring) respond to irregular surface of the glass which causes grooves with different depth. In other words, the cutting force is variable with respect to the irregular surface of the glass. See col. 1, lines 3-27. For example, in a thicker area of the glass, the spring is compressed more to create a stronger cutting force. In a thinner area of the glass, the spring extends more to create a lesser cutting force.

Therefore, steps (c) and (e) are inherent in Frederick.

Frederick does not teach step (d) which is to measure the thickness of the glass sheet.

Ota teaches the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet 2 by a measurement sensor 4 so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information for making a good cut on the glass sheet. See Fig. 1

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information as taught by Ota to the cutting method of Frederick for making a good cut on the glass sheet.

Regarding claim 30, a position sensor 30 for detecting the position of the cutting tool 16 across the glass sheet 12 is best seen in Figs. 1-2 in Frederick. A position sensor 4 also is best seen in Fig. 2 in Ota. It is noted that in Frederick glass cutting machine, the scoring device applies a greater cutting force in a thicker area, and lesser cutting force in a thinner area as explained in claim 29.

Regarding claim 34, Frederick teaches a method for cutting a continuously moving glass sheet during production of flat glass with an inhomogeneous thickness distribution across the glass sheet, the method comprising the steps of:

a) providing a moving glass sheet 12 that is continuously moving in a travel direction;

Art Unit: 3724

b) moving a cutting tool 16 across the moving glass sheet at an angle (90 degrees) to the travel direction of the moving glass sheet so that the cutting tool traverses a plurality of positions on the glass sheet;

e) mechanically breaking the glass sheet along the fissure (by a snap roll 21); and See Figs. 1-2.

Regarding steps (d) and (f) which are to apply variable cutting force on the glass sheet wherein the cutting force is increased where the variable thickness increases and the cutting force is decreased where the variable thickness decreases, and to control the variable cutting force. Frederick does not explicitly teach those steps. However, Frederick teaches using conventional biasing mean for biasing the scoring device 16 to the glass.

Grzymislawski teaches that the conventional biasing means (spring) respond to irregular surface of the glass which cause grooves with different depth. In other words, the cutting force is variable with respect to the irregular surface of the glass. See col. 1, lines 3-27. For example, in a thicker area of the glass, the spring is compressed more to create a stronger cutting force. In a thinner area of the glass, the spring extends more to create a lesser cutting force.

Therefore, steps (d) and (f) are inherent in Frederick.

Frederick does not teach step (c) which is to measure the thickness of the glass sheet.

a measurement

Page 6

Ota teaches the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet 2 by a measurement sensor 4 so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information for making a good cut on the glass sheet. See Fig. 1

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information as taught by Ota to the cutting method of Frederick for making a good cut on the glass sheet.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 31-33 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29 and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4510. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Application/Control Number: 10/523,850 Page 7

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Phong H Nguyen/

Examiner, Art Unit 3724

December 26, 2010